



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, facing tasks that tower above our power to achieve, with a sense of our utter inadequacy we bow for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer. We come with hearts solemnized by the costly sacrifice which every day is being made to defend the liberty which is the very breath of our life. Hear our supplication as out of our gratitude and our grief, our longing solicitude wings its way over dim leagues to those absent, dearer to us than life itself, joined to us in a living fellowship that no danger or distance can sever.

The long rows of the fallen on far beaches stain the red of our flag to a new luster as, with aching hearts strangely moved, we salute the broad stripes and bright stars, singing softly in our hearts, not without sobs but with new meaning,

"O beautiful for heroes proved

In liberating strife,

Who more than self their country loved,
And freedom more than life."

As soldiers marching with them in that liberating strife, in this time of tumult, in this hour of danger, in this night of anxiety, give us calmness of mind, stability of purpose, consecration to duty, and a stern determination to finish the work which Thou hast given us to do. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 12, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GILLETTE). The clerk will call the roll.

XC—368

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Revercomb
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McClellan	Truman
Byrd	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Weeks
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	Overton	Wiley
George	Pepper	Willis
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3476) to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath Drainage District and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 9 to the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, and Mr. PLOESER were appointed managers on the part of the House.

TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES DISBURSING OFFICERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens and representatives of various real-estate companies and corporations of New York City, and vicinity, New York, praying for amendment of the rent-control section of the Emergency Price Control Act so as to remove alleged inequities therefrom, which were ordered to lie on the table.

PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION PROGRAM—PETITIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have received a petition reading as follows:

The new Senate-proposed price-control bill with 12 crippling amendments would break the back of price control and the whole stabilization program. If it became law it would be the beginning of real inflation which is bad for the people and our Nation at war.

We urge you work and vote for a strong price control law and full stabilization including wage adjustments to bring wages in line with already high cost of living.

5825

*The petition is signed by approximately 1,000 members of the United Electrical Workers Union, Local 218, of Springfield, Vt.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator request that the petition be printed in the RECORD together with the names signed thereto?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not ask to have the petition or the names printed in the RECORD. I simply wish to have the body of the petition which I have read shown in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Vermont will be received and lie on the table.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read into the RECORD and to have appropriately referred a very short statement or letter from the City Port Commission of Lorain, Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. The letter is as follows:

CITY PORT COMMISSION,
Lorain, Ohio, June 9, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: The members of the port commission of the city of Lorain, Ohio, wish to inform you that they have gone on record in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, and wish to urge your support of this long-deferred and urgently needed project.

Respectfully yours,

J. ALBAN MINNICH, D. D. S.,
President, Lorain Port Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Vermont will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. AIKEN also presented a resolution of the City Council of Burlington, Vt., relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power agreement with Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to urging prompt approval by Congress of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power agreement with Canada

Whereas the Burlington City Council has consistently advocated the St. Lawrence seaway, as embodied in the pending Aiken-Pittenger bill now before the Congress; and

Whereas the taxpayers have in 2 years already paid, in subsidies and lost income from direct electrical and transportation receipts, more than the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway itself; and

Whereas the shortage of feed, fuel, and other farm and civilian supplies, caused largely by the lack of proper water transportation, now retards the development, not only of the farm, but of mining and the industries of the Northeastern States, especially as compared with other sections of the United States; and

Whereas the cheap power generated and distributed would create a necessary and vast improvement in the agricultural and general welfare of labor and industry throughout New York and New England; and

Whereas 78 percent of the cost of this St. Lawrence seaway project is for labor, direct

and indirect, which will contribute in no small way to post-war employment: Now therefore

Resolved, That the Burlington City Council urge prompt approval by Congress of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power agreement with Canada, in order that the project may go forward and thus create this new water highway with its great electrical benefits.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1373. A bill to provide additional pay for enlisted men of the Army assigned to the Infantry who are awarded the expert infant, man badge or the combat infantryman badge; without amendment (Rept. No. 964).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, line 16, after "\$500,000" insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the part of this appropriation which is used for the payment of compensation for personal services shall be used for the payment of compensation of persons who are members of any race comprising less than 15 percent of the total population of the United States, according to the 1940 census."

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 308), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by \$25,000.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON OPENING OF THE FIFTH WAR LOAN DRIVE

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States on June 12, 1944, in connection with the opening of the Fifth War Loan drive, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDING PRICE CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Amending Price Control," published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID (LEND-LEASE), U. N. R. A., AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4937, making appropriations for defense aid. It is the lend-lease appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4937) making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on appropriations was, under the heading "Title II—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration," on page 5, line 10, after the figures "\$450,000,000", to strike out ", not to exceed \$21,700,000 shall be available for procurement for 61,700,000 pounds of raw wool from stock piles of the United States Government existing on the date of the approval of this Act and \$43,200,000 shall be available for procurement of 345,500 bales of cotton now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation," and to insert "not to exceed \$21,700,000 shall be available for procurement of 61,700,000 pounds of domestic raw wool, or such amount of domestic raw wool as the foregoing sum will purchase, from stock piles of the United States Government existing on the date of the approval of this Act and \$43,200,000 shall be available for procurement of 345,500 bales of domestic cotton, or such amount of domestic cotton as the foregoing sum will purchase, now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the change here is principally in the use of the word "domestic" before the words "raw wool."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management—Foreign Economic Administration," on page 7, line 19, after the word "at" to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$15,000"; on page 8, line 15, after "(not exceeding \$90,000);", to strike out "\$19,500,000" and insert "\$20,000,000", and in line 16, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

OBLIGATION OF CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE TO EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt the consideration of the appropriation bill in charge of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], but I wish to make a few remarks on the subject which I discussed briefly yesterday.

No man was ever more earnest than I was yesterday when I spoke very briefly about the duty and what I consider the obligation of men who aspire to high public office today to express their opinions and their views, plainly and unequivocally, because the issues of the day demand that men speak forthrightly, honestly, and frankly.

I was in earnest yesterday. I am in earnest today, and I reiterate and re-emphasize what I said yesterday. It is time, it is time now before the meeting of the conventions, before the elections are held, for the candidates, for men who seek high office, to tell the people and to tell the delegates to their own conventions just where they stand on every issue, foreign and domestic.

Yesterday the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jackson] eloquently spoke of the dead and dying on the beachheads of France, of those—and I am quoting the Senator—

Sons . . . lost in the Straits of Dover . . . boys . . . entangled in the barbed wire . . . bombed out of the sky, and (of those) precious and hopeful bodies (which) have been turned into putrescent flesh.

In those brief remarks the Senator from Indiana said:

I have now determined that some time before next election day, when my short term here will end, I shall make a special effort to speak in behalf of the aspirations of humanity in the field of a permanent, perpetual, just, and Christian peace.

And again the Senator said:

America must learn of blood in order to realize that mankind is worth saving, and that if it is to be saved, it must be saved under the leadership of this Republic.

O Mr. President, I endorse every word of that utterance by the Senator from Indiana, but I do not want him, nor do I want others who also entertain strong and vigorous opinions, to delay too long in giving expression to their thoughts and views.

Right here, I think, Mr. President, it is not out of place to read a most moving prayer which was uttered by the radio commentator, Gabriel Heatter, on his broadcast of June 6 last. This is the prayer Mr. Heatter prayed:

Merciful God watch over these men. They march in a crusade for humanity and freedom. These are not men of war. These are not men of hate or vengeance. These are humble men. Men whose hearts will never forget pity and mercy. They fight to give all the children of men peace on earth. They fight to banish tyranny and fear. Merciful God our homes are empty—our hearts are torn with this desperate vigil.

Into your care we give our prayers—our lives—our sons—all that we are and can ever hope to be on this earth—send these men back to us—home to us—for they are part of man's spirit—of man's dream of a world which is free and where kindness lives—watch over these men—we who are meek and humble—we whose faith is strong ask this. Send these men back to our hearts and our homes—this is our prayer.

Mr. President, when we consider the men who are dying for these high principles, can any man hesitate to risk his political life, when the welfare of the Nation and of the world is involved? I repeat, Mr. President, the time is now.

I said yesterday, and I have said today, that I was as much in earnest as it is possible for a man to be, and I mentioned the fact yesterday that the last leader of the great Republican Party, the man it had chosen to be its candidate for President of the United States, was writing a series of articles outlining his views as to what the platform of his party should contain. In a way, I complimented Mr. Willkie for his forthrightness in so declaring what the Republican Party platform should contain; but not being a member of his party I hesitated to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article which Mr. Willkie had written. Naturally and surely, I thought, some Member on the other side of the Chamber, or some Member of the minority party in the House of Representatives, would place a statement of that kind in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And while I had it here on my desk, being a Democrat, I did not ask permission to insert it in the RECORD.

This morning I went through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, hurriedly, to be sure, because our time is limited, but, so far as I can determine, and I think it is true, not a Republican asked that the views of their last candidate for President be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, Mr. President, regardless of the fact that I am a Democrat, regardless of the fact that I have no right to speak and I do not speak for the Republican Party, I now ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Willkie yesterday be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall not discuss what Mr. Willkie said yesterday, nor shall I discuss what he said in his article published this morning, but I now ask that the article written by Mr. Willkie appearing in this morning's newspaper be printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD immediately following the article of yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is not important to me now what views Mr. Willkie is expressing, and certainly I would not attempt to argue or persuade or even suggest what the minority party ought to declare in its platform. That is for the Republican Party to determine. But the important thing, Mr. President, about which I am speaking, and about which I spoke yesterday, is this: It is important to declare now frankly, candidly, and forthrightly, exactly what is proposed, both internationally and domestically. As a boy we used to have a saying: "Say what you mean and mean what you say."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator apply that saying and send it as a special message to Mr. Roosevelt in the White House—to say what he means and mean what he says? If the Senator will do that, and if the President will apply that saying to himself in connection with international relations, we may know to some extent what his position is. But the President has made speech after speech in which his position has varied widely. The ideals which he expressed a few months ago have simply "gone with the wind." No one knows where he stands today. It is time he spoke out. He is the President of the United States. The country is waiting. The people of the country are listening. The leader of every other Allied country has spoken out clearly and unmistakably.

Mr. Roosevelt has been silent. The Senator purports to stand for the Atlantic Charter. Where does Roosevelt stand on the Atlantic Charter today? I should like to know.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, naturally the question which the Senator from New Hampshire has asked was anticipated. I naturally thought that someone would ask that question. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that before I conclude my remarks, if he will remain in the Chamber, I shall tell him what Mr. Roosevelt stands for, and I shall tell him upon a record which has been made for more than 25 years. I shall tell him in the language of the Scriptures, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator include in that record how Mr. Roosevelt, in 1932, repudiated the League of Nations, for which Woodrow Wilson stood? He was a part of that administration. Will the Senator tell the whole record which includes more of the inconsistencies of the man who today sits in the White House?

Mr. HATCH. I can answer every question the Senator asks by the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, if necessary; but, far better, by the acts which he has done as President of the United States,

and by the risks he took as a candidate for office. I shall come to that later.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator certainly cannot compare the words and the acts; so I can see very clearly that he must follow either the words or the acts, because in many instances the words and the acts fail to coincide.

Mr. HATCH. I understand the Senator's position. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I appreciate the strong stand he has taken on international affairs. I wish to compliment him for the position which he has steadfastly avowed and followed. I wish that the Republican candidates for President, whoever they may be, were as strong, forthright, and vigorous in their statements as the Senator from New Hampshire has been.

Presently, before I conclude, I shall refer to the other matters in which the Senator is so much interested.

Mr. President, as I recall, when I was interrupted I had just reiterated a statement which we used to make when we were boys. In boyish language, we said, "Say what you mean, and mean what you say." That is what I am referring to now. As I said awhile ago, if the boys who are fighting on the beachheads of France equivocated and hesitated in their grim and ghastly duty, if they hesitated to take a stand, faltered, wavered, and retreated, the cause of freedom would be lost. If political lives are lost as the result of frank and candid discussion, is it not better for men to die politically than to win by evasion?

Rightly it may be asked why I, as a Democrat, am so much interested in what the other party may say or do. It may be asked, Why not wait until the convention has met and the platform has been written? Why not take what is said in the platform as the utterances of the candidate?

If we could rely upon platform declarations, that question would be proper, entirely in place, and I should be entirely out of place in asking, as I am doing, and as I did yesterday, that all men who aspire to office—and that includes Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, and includes Democrats as well as Republicans—shall frankly state their views on all issues.

Mr. President, I have a memory; perhaps it is too vivid a memory for my own peace of mind; sometimes I wish I might forget; but my memory carries me back 24 years. It is a memory of great issues in a great campaign, which involved the principle of whether this Nation should take her rightful place and participate in the affairs of the world. I have a memory of a declaration made by the Republican Party in its platform 24 years ago. I read that plank today. It was a solemn declaration by a great party in convention assembled:

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general conference whenever peace shall

be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and their power for the prevention of war.

The declaration envisions military force, if you please, for the prevention of war. Twenty-four years ago the Republican Party wrote that strong declaration into its platform. Mr. President, experience has proved that we cannot rely upon platform declarations. The plank which I have just read is a stronger declaration than that of the Mackinac conference. It is even a stronger declaration of purpose and principle than was contained in the resolution which we adopted in the Senate a few months ago. Surely the declaration that "an international association must be based upon justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by development of law and the decision of impartial courts" embraced a principle which not only should have had universal support by all parties but should have been carried out faithfully, which was not done.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wonder if the Senator can indicate at what time, approximately, he will tell where Roosevelt stands, where the Democratic Party stands, and where he stands at present on our peace aims. I should like to be present and listen to him.

Mr. HATCH. I shall not consume very much time. I wish to conclude these remarks. I shall probably conclude within 15 minutes at the most.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to hear what the Senator has to say on that subject.

Mr. HATCH. I do not suppose the Senator has any doubt as to where I stand.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I think the Senator is very sincere.

Mr. HATCH. I have spoken all over the country—

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to hear where Roosevelt stands, where the Democratic Party stands, and just how far in their views they are from the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Very well. I shall answer that question now, since the Senator does not wish to stay, but wishes to leave.

I shall go back, as I say, 24 years. I shall go back to a time when it might have paid men, politically, to equivocate, when it might have paid men to make a speech on this side of the League of Nations, favoring it, which could just as easily have been interpreted as being on the other side, against it. As I shall presently show—and I mean no disrespect for the dead—that is exactly what the Republican candidate did in that year.

So I am going back 24 years, to read to the Senator the declaration of the Democratic Party. I will tell the Senator that at that time Franklin D. Roosevelt was a candidate for Vice President. It would have furthered his political aims if he had equivocated and had refused to stand on that platform. But, nevertheless, he

took the dangerous way, the courageous way, and said, "On this plank I stand."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has been speaking of the very courageous manner in which President Roosevelt, the then candidate for Vice President, stood. I should like to have him explain to me why he repudiated that stand in 1932, when he was a candidate for President.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator crowds me too much; I cannot answer everything at once. I told him I would start with this. I will go along to 1932.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. I am also coming to 1936, 1940, and 1944.

I read further from the Democratic Party's platform in 1920:

The Democratic Party favors the League of Nations—

No equivocation about that—

as the surest, if not the only, practicable means of maintaining the peace of the world and terminating the insufferable burden of great military and naval establishments. It was for this that America broke away from traditional isolation and spent her blood and treasure to crush a colossal scheme of conquest. It was upon this basis that the President of the United States, in prearrangement with our allies, consented to a suspension of hostilities against the Imperial German Government; the armistice was granted and a treaty of peace negotiated upon the definite assurance to Germany, as well as to the powers pitted against Germany, that "a general association of nations must be formed, under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike."

There is no equivocation there.

For those things Franklin Roosevelt, as a candidate for office, stood in 1920.

I read further from the platform:

Hence, we not only congratulate the President on the vision manifested and the vigor exhibited in the prosecution of the war, but we felicitate him and his associates on the exceptional achievement at Paris involved in the adoption of a league and treaty so near akin to previously expressed American ideals and so intimately related to the aspirations of civilized peoples, everywhere.

Mr. President, I shall omit a part of the declaration, because it is long. Senators are familiar with it. But I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We commend the President for his courage and his high conception of good faith in steadfastly standing for the covenant agreed to by all the associated and Allied Nations at war with Germany, and we condemn the Republican Senate for its refusal to ratify the treaty merely because it was the product of Democratic statesmanship, thus interposing partisan envy and personal hatred in the way of the peace and renewed prosperity of the world.

By every accepted standard of international morality, the President is justified in

asserting that the honor of the country is involved in this business; and we point to the accusing fact that before it was determined to initiate political antagonism to the treaty, the now Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee himself publicly proclaimed that any proposition for a separate peace with Germany, such as he and his party associates thereafter reported to the Senate, would make us "guilty of the blackest crime."

On May 15 last the Knox substitute for the Versailles Treaty was passed by the Republican Senate; and this convention can contrive no more fitting characterization of its obloquy than that made in the *Forum* magazine of June 1918 by Henry Cabot Lodge, when he said:

"If we send our armies and young men abroad to be killed and wounded in northern France and Flanders with no result but this, our entrance into war with such an intention was a crime which nothing can justify. The intent of Congress and the intent of the President was that there could be no peace until we could create a situation where no such war as this could recur. We cannot make peace except in company with our allies. It would brand us with everlasting dishonor and bring ruin to us also if we undertook to make a separate peace."

Thus to that which Mr. Lodge, in saner moments, considered the blackest crime, he and his party in madness sought to give the sanctity of law; that which 18 months ago was of "everlasting dishonor," the Republican Party and its candidates today accept as the essence of faith.

We endorse the President's view of our international obligations and his firm stand against reservations designed to cut to pieces the vital provisions of the Versailles Treaty and we commend the Democrats in Congress for voting against resolutions for separate peace which would disgrace the Nation. We advocate the immediate ratification of the treaty without reservations which would impair its essential integrity; but do not oppose the acceptance of any reservations making clearer or more specific the obligations of the United States to the League associates. Only by doing this may we retrieve the reputation of this Nation among the powers of the earth and recover the moral leadership which President Wilson won and which Republican politicians at Washington sacrificed. Only by doing this may we hope to aid effectively in the restoration of order throughout the world and to take the place which we should assume in the front rank of spiritual, commercial, and industrial advancement.

We reject as utterly vain, if not vicious, the Republican assumption that ratification of the treaty and membership in the League of Nations would in anywise impair the integrity or independence of our country. The fact that the Covenant has been entered into by 29 nations, all as jealous of their independence as we are of ours, is a sufficient refutation of such charge.

The President repeatedly has declared, and this convention reaffirms, that all our duties and obligations as a member of the League must be fulfilled in strict conformity with the Constitution of the United States, embodied in which is the fundamental requirement of declaratory action by the Congress before this Nation may become a participant in any war.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, upon that declaration Mr. Roosevelt stood, as I have said, forthrightly, when it might have been to his advantage not so to stand.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has referred to 1932, and, I presume, to a so-called repudiation of the

League of Nations declaration as it was embodied in the platform of 1920. I think that statement was supposed to have been made to Mr. Hearst. I have no knowledge about the statement. I have no understanding as to what was involved. But certainly the League of Nations, as it was formed in 1920, in 1932 could well have been improved upon and strengthened. I do not believe Mr. Roosevelt ever repudiated the idea of an association of nations. I say that Mr. Roosevelt never repudiated the part this Nation should play in world affairs. In 1937, in a speech made in Chicago, he advocated quarantining aggressor nations.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from New Hampshire is now engaged in a conversation. I thought he was interested in what I was saying.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say I was just sending to my office to get a copy of the repudiation of Mr. Roosevelt of the League of Nations, so that I could quote it to the Senator from New Mexico, in case he has never happened to see it.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. President, I was referring to the speech made in 1937, at Chicago, when Mr. Roosevelt advocated quarantining the aggressor nations, and advocated the participation of this Nation in such a quarantine. He advocated doing exactly what the Republican platform declared for in 1920. But for his pains, for his foresight—and it was foresight—and for his courage he was proclaimed here on the floor of the Senate—and I sat here and heard it—a warmonger, a person who was trying to get us into war.

If the advice Franklin D. Roosevelt gave in 1937 had been followed by this country, and by the other nations of the world, for that matter—for Mr. Roosevelt was not only ahead of our own people, but was also ahead of other nations—the blood bath, the invasion of Czechoslovakia and Poland, the conquest of the entire European Continent, the subjection of millions of men and women to slavery, the terrible price we pay today in the blood of our own sons, might never have been required.

The Senator from New Hampshire asked me where President Roosevelt stands. I will tell him where President Roosevelt stands, based upon his record, based upon his public utterances, and based in part upon personal conversations. Franklin D. Roosevelt believes this world is too small for any nation to isolate itself from the rest of the world. Franklin D. Roosevelt believes that the same bravery and courage manifested by our sons, as they have always done in times of war, should be manifested by this Nation in times of peace.

I am proud of the record of my country in time of war. We never have hesitated. We have paid whatever price was necessary. And we are doing it today. I am not ashamed of what my country has done in time of war.

I am not so sure about times of peace. I say to you, Mr. President, that Mr. Roosevelt believes, as I believe, that we should demonstrate the same interest,

the same courage, and the same willingness to suffer and to sacrifice, if necessary, in times of peace that we do in times of war; and that means taking our proper place among the nations of the world.

Mr. Roosevelt believes in a court of justice. He believes that the issues and disputes which arise among nations should be settled according to the principles of law and justice, instead of according to the power of might and destruction. Does the Senator have any doubt about that? As I have already said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Read the record of this body with reference to the World Court. Read the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt and see what he stood for. The record is clear.

Mr. President, in political years we are likely to confuse issues. I am not charging the Senator from New Hampshire with doing so. I repeat the compliment which I paid him a while ago. I meant every word which I said about him. I wish he would accord to our President some degree of courtesy and faith, because after all, he is the Senator's President as much as he is my President.

To achieve the ends to which I have referred, to provide the necessary machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations without recourse to war, I am sure Franklin D. Roosevelt is today ready to sacrifice, if necessary, his political life. Yes; and he also believes in the independence of nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Allow me to complete my thought.

The President believes in the right of the people of each nation to establish for themselves a government of their own choosing. He believes no more in the domination by this country of other nations than he believes in the domination of other nations by Germany.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has said that he believes the President would stake his political future or political existence upon the attainment of the end which he seeks. I wonder if it is the Senator's opinion that Mr. Roosevelt feels so strongly in his convictions that in order to have unity in this country he would be willing to announce today or tomorrow that he is through with public office, that he would put peace aims above partisan politics, and that he would be willing to pass from the political picture in order to gain a uniform agreement in this Nation by both parties concerning peace aims.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I assert that I personally believe that Mr. Roosevelt would be willing to make that sacrifice because he believes so strongly in the principles which he has announced. But I say to the Senator that I would not be willing for him to make such a sacrifice, and neither would the Democratic Party be willing that he make the sacrifice.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why?

Mr. HATCH. Because we remember that 20 years ago the people of America were led out on a limb of united support for an association of nations for the prevention of war. We also remember how the Republican Party destroyed that hope. We shall not be caught there again.

A platform declaration is not sufficient. A declaration of the individual himself is required. Let me again read from the history which was written 24 years ago. I quote from a book entitled "The United States and the League of Nations," by D. F. Fleming. In that book may be found the following statement by Chester H. Rowell, former Republican national committeeman for California:

One half of the speeches—

Referring to the speeches of candidate Harding—

were for the League of Nations, if you read them hastily, but if you read them with care every word of them could have been read critically as against the League of Nations. The other half were violent speeches against the League of Nations, if you read them carelessly, but if you read them critically every one of them could be interpreted as in favor of the League of Nations.

Mr. President, that quotation comes not from me, but from a former Republican national committeeman for the State of California. In the light of those speeches—I do not wish to refer critically to one who has gone—and in the light of the strict declaration made in the Republican platform, I say that it is necessary for a declaration to be made now, without equivocation.

So strongly 24 years ago did certain outstanding Republicans believe in a League of Nations, and so concerned were they in the equivocal utterances that were made and their fears that their party's position might not be understood, that 38 outstanding Republicans, Senators, and others, issued a statement which related all their difficulties in interpreting the position of their candidate and the position of their party. The statement was published in full, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I invite attention to the fact that among the first signatures on the statement is that of Herbert Hoover. The next signature is that of Charles Evans Hughes, followed by the signatures of numerous other men, including Elihu Root.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The paper signed by 38 Republican Senators in March 1919, before the League Covenant was adopted at Paris, advised the President that the signers could not approve a treaty in the form then proposed, although it was their sincere desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace and general disarmament.

A majority of the Senate voted to ratify the League amendment with modifications, which there is good evidence to show would have been accepted by the other nations; but Mr. Wilson refused to accept these modifications, and insisted upon the agreement absolutely unchanged, and Democratic Senators suffi-

cient in number to defeat the treaty as modified followed Mr. Wilson by voting against ratification.

That is substantially the difference between the parties now. The Democratic platform and candidate stand unqualifiedly for the agreement negotiated at Paris without substantive modification.

On the other hand, the Republican platform says: "The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts; and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war."

Mr. Harding said in his speech of August 28: "There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is offensive and defensive alliance of great powers. * * * The other type is a society of free nations, or a league of free nations animated by consideration of right and justice instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace, but so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility. Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinction as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society or a league, or what not. Our concern is solely with the substance, not the form thereof."

Mr. Harding has since repeatedly reaffirmed the declarations of this speech in the most positive terms.

The question accordingly is not between a league and no league, but is whether certain provisions in the proposed league agreement shall be accepted unchanged or shall be changed.

The contest is not about the principle of a league of nations but it is about the method of most effectively applying that principle to preserve peace.

If the proposed changes in the Paris agreement were captious or without substantial grounds, one might question the sincerity of their advocates. This, however, is not the case.

The principal change proposed concerns article X of the League Covenant as negotiated at Paris. Mr. Wilson declares this to be "the heart of the League" and the chief controversy is about this.

Article X provides that the nations agreeing to the treaty shall "preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League."

That is an obligation of the most vital importance and it certainly binds every nation entering into it to go to war whenever war may be necessary to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any member of the League against external aggression.

It is idle to say that Congress has power to refuse to authorize such a war, for whenever the treaty calls for war, a refusal by Congress to pass the necessary resolution would be a refusal by our Government to keep the obligation of the treaty. The alternative would be war or a breach of the solemnly pledged faith of the United States.

We cannot regard such a provision as necessary or useful for a league to preserve peace.

We have reached the conclusion that the true course to bring America into an effective league to preserve peace is not by insisting with Mr. Cox upon the acceptance of such a

provision as article X, thus prolonging the unfortunate situation created by Mr. Wilson's insistence upon that article, but by frankly calling upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate this vital objection and other objections less the subject of dispute.

For this course we can look only to the Republican Party and its candidate; the Democratic Party and Mr. Cox are not bound to follow it. The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the declared object is attained.

The conditions of Europe make it essential that the stabilizing effect of the treaty already made between the European powers shall not be lost by them and that the necessary changes be made by changing the terms of that treaty rather than by beginning entirely anew.

That course Mr. Harding is willing to follow, for he said in his speech of August 28: "I would take and combine all that is good and excise all that is bad from both organizations" (the Court and the League). This statement is broad enough to include the suggestion that if the League which has heretofore riveted our considerations and apprehensions has been so entwined and interwoven into the peace of Europe that its good must be preserved in order to stabilize the peace of that continent, then it can be amended or revised so that we may still have a remnant of the world's aspirations in 1918 build into the world's highest conception of helpful cooperation in the ultimate realization.

We therefore believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the Presidency.

Lyman Abbott; Nicholas Murray Butler, president, Columbia University; Robert S. Brookings, president, Washington University, St. Louis; Paul D. Cravath; Charles W. Dabney, University of Cincinnati; William H. P. Faunce, president, Brown University; Frank J. Goodnow, Johns Hopkins University; Warren Gregory, San Francisco; John Grier Hibben, president, Princeton University; Herbert Hoover; Charles Evans Hughes; Alexander C. Humphries, president, Stevens Institute of Technology; Ernest M. Hopkins, President, Dartmouth College; William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts; Samuel McCune Lindsay, President, Academy Political Science, Columbia University; A. Lawrence Lowell, president, Harvard University; chairman, Executive Committee, League to Enforce Peace; John Henry MacCracken, president, Lafayette College; Samuel Mather, Cleveland, Ohio; George A. Plimpton, president, board of trustees, Amherst College; Henry S. Pritchett, president, Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching; Charles A. Richmond, president, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; Elihu Root; Jacob Gould Schurman, former president, Cornell University; Henry L. Stimson; Oscar S. Straus, member, executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; Henry W. Taft, member, executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; Isaac M. Ullman, New Haven, member, executive committee, League to Enforce Peace; William Allen White, editor, Emporia, Kans.; George W. Wickersham, member, executive commit-

tee, League to Enforce Peace; W. W. Willoughby, professor of political science, Johns Hopkins University; Ray Lyman Wilbur, president, Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I realize that my remarks today may seem to be an attack upon the opposition party, but that is not at all my purpose. What I have tried to stress is simply that men who aspire for office in either party have a duty and obligation to tell the people what they believe.

I am reminded, Mr. President, of the birth of the Republican Party, a party that was formed in time of stress, in time of great trial in this Nation; a party which came into power because its leaders had the courage to take what were then unpopular positions, and, at the risk of their political lives, maintain their cause. I am reminded, Mr. President, of those famous debates between Lincoln and Douglas. Men did not hesitate to say what they thought.

I have referred to a man who has been severely condemned on the floor of the Senate; I do not suppose there has ever been a kind word said about him here; I have no particular reason to say anything good about him now; but some months ago when Mr. Willkie was supposed to be a candidate for the office of President of the United States, and Mr. Dewey was the other candidate, Drew Pearson, the commentator and columnist, urged that a series of debates be held throughout the country between Mr. Willkie and Mr. Dewey so that the people might understand exactly what views they entertained. I am sorry, Mr. President, that course was not followed. I think it would be a splendid thing today in this hour of genuine and mighty issues for men to take the stump and oppose each other and let the people decide which views they want to have prevail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has been very kind and courteous and has inserted two statements of Wendell Willkie into the RECORD. I have in my hand another statement Mr. Willkie made in Omaha on April 5, and in order that the RECORD may be kept straight, may I quote to the Senator a few of the pertinent questions Mr. Willkie asked in that speech.

Mr. HATCH. May I ask that they follow my remarks?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are really very pertinent.

Mr. HATCH. Very well; go ahead; I do not care.

Mr. BRIDGES. I quote from what Mr. Willkie said in Omaha on April 5, as follows:

What is America's foreign policy?

The United States today is deeply concerned about its foreign policy.

Have we a foreign policy? If so, what is it? How does it apply to the various international problems that are already facing us? Are the noble aims expressed by Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt anything but pious platitudes?

The discontent and the unease of the American people are finding expression in just such

questions as these. Their worry has communicated itself to Congress. Twenty-seven "freshmen" Republican Congressmen have laid their questions before Secretary Hull. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has asked him for enlightenment. The President himself has at last felt the surge of popular concern.

Before the next President of the United States has been elected, the pace of this war will have been stepped up. There are millions of Americans in the fighting services, and millions on the home front, for whom this spring and this summer may be the most decisive seasons of their lives. A man holds his breath when he thinks about this.

So it is natural that the people want to know more clearly "Why?" and "What for?" They are in the dark. It is wartime, and foreign policy does not seem to them a plaything for routine diplomats or "kitchen" cabinets. It can mean life or death to men and to nations. The people's demand for knowledge is rolling up like a great wave. It is beating against the silence of the State Department. It is lapping at the edges of White House complacency.

There are two grave charges to be brought against the political conduct of this war in Washington. I made them 3 years ago, before we were formally at war. I made them a year and a half ago when I went around the world to see the war and the people who were fighting it. And I made them a year ago when I wrote a book about the war I had seen and the fears and hopes springing from it.

I shall continue to make them—

And so on. I should like to put the entire speech in the RECORD, because it certainly is expressive when we consider that Mr. Willkie wrote the articles which the Senator put in the RECORD, and it gives one other viewpoint, and raises a series of questions about which Mr. Willkie is concerned, and it is in my judgment one of the ablest speeches Mr. Willkie ever made.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to the speech being put in the RECORD. I do not agree with everything Mr. Willkie says, but many things he says are illuminating and should be put into the RECORD, and I have no objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The speech referred to is as follows:
[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 6, 1944]

What is America's foreign policy?

The United States today is deeply concerned about its foreign policy.

Have we a foreign policy? If so, what is it? How does it apply to the various international problems that are already facing us? Are the noble aims expressed by Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt anything but pious platitudes?

The discontent and the unease of the American people are finding expression in just such questions as these. Their worry has communicated itself to Congress. Twenty-seven "freshmen" Republican Congressmen have laid their questions before Secretary Hull. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has asked him for enlightenment. The President himself has at last felt the surge of popular concern.

Before the next President of the United States has been elected, the pace of this war will have been stepped up. There are millions of Americans in the fighting services,

and millions on the home front, for whom this spring and this summer may be the most decisive seasons of their lives. A man holds his breath when he thinks about this.

SAYS PEOPLE ARE IN DARK

So it is natural that the people want to know more clearly "Why?" and "What for?" They are in the dark. It is wartime, and foreign policy does not seem to them a plaything for routine diplomats or "kitchen" cabinets. It can mean life or death to men and to nations. The people's demand for knowledge is rolling up like a great wave. It is beating against the silence of the State Department. It is lapping at the edges of White House complacency.

There are two grave charges to be brought against the political conduct of this war in Washington. I made them 3 years ago, before we were formally at war. I made them a year and a half ago when I went around the world to see the war and the people who were fighting it. And I made them a year ago when I wrote a book about the war I had seen and the fears and hopes springing from it.

I shall continue to make them, whether I am the Republican candidate for President or not, so long as they remain true and are festering in the minds and hearts of people all over the world.

The first charge is that the Roosevelt administration has not dealt squarely with the rest of the world in this war. It has confused our fighting allies. It has disappointed those who look to us for leadership when they get a chance to fight. It has embittered and disillusioned those who fight underground against our common enemies. This is the first charge I make—that the administration has confused the political and military conduct of the war to an extent where uncertainty has taken the place of assurance, delay, of action. This means prolonging the war and wasting lives, by not telling the world in plain terms what we stand for and what we are fighting for.

ADMINISTRATION NOT FAIR

The second charge I made is that the Roosevelt administration has not dealt squarely with the American people in this war. It has committed us to unknown policies, worked out by secret agents and in secret conferences. It has used the excuse of military expediency to cover up the letting down of people who are our friends and dealings with the Fascists who are our enemies. It has discouraged the efforts of the American press to inform us candidly of the facts of the international situation. It has bargained for votes at home on the fallacious theory that Americans vote not as Americans but as pressure groups defending the interests of cliques inside countries they or their ancestors left long years ago. This then is my second charge—that the administration is not being square with the American people, and is promoting confusion, cynicism and distrust among us.

Both these charges are grave. But they are justified. And because they are justified the Republican Party has not alone the obligation to nominate the right man this year in order to save the party; it has also the responsibility of turning the searchlight of truth upon the motives and forces which make my charges so tragically serious. The immediate goal of every American is to win the war with the least possible loss of life and save the fruits of victory. The one fruit of victory that is going to taste best in the mouths of Americans is peace—prolonged and stable peace. I ask you, as I have asked myself, How can we possibly secure this peace by following leadership which is already indicted in the hearts of most of us—whether we say it or not—on these two charges? For the administration policies which I am criticizing are not the result of accidents, or

honest mistakes. They spring from the dangerous idea that we, the American people, are not to be trusted with our own destiny.

This is the thinking of a government that even when young weakened the people by its paternalistic attitude, and now, old, tired, and cynical, attempts to keep the people weak by keeping them ignorant.

Let's consider my first charge—that this administration is not now dealing squarely with the people of the world. What is being done in Washington is so muddled, so hesitant, and so devious that it makes an easy life for the propagandists in Berlin and Tokyo.

What does a Frenchman in France, for example, or a Belgian in Belgium, or a Chinese in the conquered parts of China, or—for that matter—a Russian in the Soviet Union, think of our failure to set up a United Nations council? I have been urging it, as have others, for a very long time. It is no secret that some of our allies have been urging it. The United States is the one country with enough strength and prestige and disinterestedness to take the leadership in setting up such a body.

Yet nothing has been done. There are said to be secret commissions at work in London, in Naples, and in Washington, on regional problems. But they are more than secret. The American people know nothing of what they are doing, and apparently they keep their deliberations secret even from their own governments. Our State Department, in turn, often fails to transmit its decisions to its representatives abroad. An American official has, on occasion, walked into a conference with Allied officials to learn for the first time that an agreement had been already worked out in Washington on the subject under discussion. No one had taken the trouble to inform him. As in the whole history of our political relations with Italy during the last year, secrecy seems to be the cover for bungling or worse.

SECRECY ON TWO FRONTS

The same thing is true of the secrecy which surrounds the activities of the European Advisory Commission in London and of the Pacific War Council in Washington. These bodies may well be making serious decisions; they may even be making dangerous decisions, as the rumors and reports of enemy propaganda say. I don't know whether their decisions are good or bad, and neither do you. So it is hard for a man living on the Continent of Europe to know. And since he doesn't know, it is easy for him to believe the rumors and the propaganda and to assume that we are not working frankly through a United Nations council because we have something to hide.

This hurts us coming and going. It hurts us coming because it produces an unfriendly strain between us and our three chief fighting Allies—Britain, Russia, and China. It hurts us going because it produces fear and suspicion in the millions of people now ruled by our enemies who must some day be our allies if we are to win the war quickly and work out a lasting peace.

Take our relation to Great Britain. There is indication of unnecessary friction there. It is important for successful cooperation now and for common welfare in the future that our countries should work out their destinies in harmony with each other. But there is no natural law which ordains friendship between us and Great Britain. It behooves statesmen on both sides to guard and cherish our good relations and to set up machinery to eliminate unnecessary misunderstandings.

What has Mr. Roosevelt's administration done toward this end? We have had lend-lease for some time and recently a United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization has been set up. But whether in the oil fields of Arabia, in China, or in South America, the administration has provoked among

the British distrust and suspicion of our motives.

Even when our motives are good, the methods we use seem calculated to produce mistrust. We have slowed up our decisions on questions of tremendous mutual importance to both countries, such as the recognition of the French National Liberation Committee. We have failed to consult our ally on problems in which the British have an important and historical interest. We have utterly failed to work out any machinery for political cooperation with London comparable to the military understanding which has been achieved under General Eisenhower.

When Englishmen say—as they do say today—that they cannot understand us, I cannot blame them. Yet if we had a United Nations council, meeting continually, to thresh out political problems as they arise and to accustom diplomats on both sides to seek common solutions for all problems, this distrust and this suspicion would largely vanish.

There is indication of unnecessary friction between ourselves and the Soviet Union. The Moscow agreements and the Teheran statement were brave, fighting words. They gave heart to all of us. Regardless of party, we supported them.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

But what has the administration done to follow up this first step? Mr. Hull came back from Moscow and Mr. Roosevelt from Teheran, and each mile of the distance they traveled has seemed to grow longer since they returned. For Mr. Hull the trip to Moscow was an enormous success, he reported. Mr. Roosevelt's conversation in Teheran ended with the announcement that: "We leave here friends, in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

What is the evidence of this friendship, this common purpose? In England apparently our purposes have been so little understood that we have at last had to send Mr. Stettinius over to try to smooth matters out. On the Polish question, the United States, Great Britain, and Russia seem to be further apart than ever. When Mr. Stalin decided to send a man to represent Russian interests with the superannuated general of Mussolini's staff whom we have maintained in power, London and Washington were filled with consternation. Yet we had been notified some days before the announcement. If we disapproved of it, why didn't we say so while there was still a chance to influence Mr. Stalin's judgment?

None of us knows what actually went on at Teheran. But the evidence is mounting that our relations with Russia remain pretty much as they were before our hopes were fed with bright prospects of friendship and understanding.

For we still have no machinery such as a United Nations executive council would provide, for working on the problems we face jointly with the Soviets. Yesterday, Mr. Churchill pointed out that the advance notice received by the British Government of the Soviet's purposes in entering Rumania was an example of the operation of consultation machinery set up by the Moscow conference. Where has this machinery been all this time? We need a continuing machinery. Our policy, however, friendly its intention, depends too much upon the President's disturbing facility and his liking for wangling things personally instead of using regular authorized instruments of government. It would not seem to me surprising if the Russians, who, as a nation, are accustomed to acting firmly and consistently alone, now, in their new role of ally, attribute the aloofness which still characterizes our relations with their Government to hidden hostility and suspicion, and, therefore, sometimes act with what seems to be a disregard of our common interests. A continuously functioning council of

the United Nations might adjust our differences in a constructive way.

Unfortunately, however, I have seen little evidence that either the President or the State Department has even begun to use the power and the prestige of this Nation toward the creation of any such effective international machinery.

PROBLEMS IN CHINA

Much the same could be said of our treatment of China. It is no military secret that there are unsettled political problems there. When Japan has been forced back to her own islands and restricted there, China will look to the West for help in restoring her own ravaged territory. She is a proud Nation. She does not want charity. But she will have a right to ask for assistance on terms which take into consideration her great sacrifices and the enormous aid she has given to the common cause. At the same time we shall owe it to our own principles, as well as to China, to see that this assistance is rendered in such a way that it is beneficial to the healthy elements in Chinese political life. Have we thought about this problem? Have we taken steps to meet it? There is no evidence that we have.

What I have said so far applies to this administration's treatment of our chief allies. They are nations which are fighting in the field. They can press their claims in Washington. What of our treatment of the other nations of the world, again in terms of the purest self-interest? What are we doing to enlist on our side the millions of suppressed people now ruled by our enemies? What are we doing by our foreign policies to speed the day when they can take over a major role in the struggle for their own liberation?

Again, I don't know. And I am worried because, if I don't know, I don't see how they can know. And such uncertainty will not hasten the end of the war.

In north Africa and in Italy our political record is, unfortunately, there for all to see. Darlan, Peyrouton, Badoglio, and the King of Italy were not conjured up by Nazi propaganda to fool the people of Europe about United States policy. They were, as far as we know, the tokens of our sincerity in dealing with two nations which had lost their freedom. It is small wonder, is it not, that the name of the United States is now greeted with silence at meetings of Frenchmen. It is small wonder that Italians, who welcomed us with open arms as liberators, now suspect us and fail to cooperate. It is small wonder, is it not, if thoughtful men and women everywhere hesitate—bewildered, angry, confused over what they can expect from us.

These are no questions of diplomatic niceties. While Mr. Roosevelt says blandly that he has come to a decision about the French people—he, mind you, not the Allied Nations with the French National Liberation Committee—while he talks of having reached a decision, French patriots are dying at the hands of the Gestapo. While he and Mr. Churchill continue to prop up the senile monarchy in Italy, thousands of Italians in the north are striking against Hitler. While the President supports tired old Fascists in the areas our armies control, millions of Europeans are preparing to help an Allied invasion of the Continent. Is it any wonder that people all over the world are asking more and more loudly "What is this all about?"

Our State Department and the President give us big promises and talk of noble aims. But there is no leadership in Washington which makes the terrible dilemmas of modern war real and understandable to the people of the world. There is no leadership which relates our aims to our performance. I think we are justified in demanding leadership in Washington which will bring these decisions which affect all our lives out of

the depths of secret power politics into the clear light of day in some United Nations council. Then the peoples of our grand alliance can see and judge what is being decided in their name.

My second charge against the foreign policy of this administration is that it does not deal squarely with the people of this country. Mr. Roosevelt, prodded by the Nation-wide demand for information, spoke the other day in some derision of those citizens who go around asking bellhops what is the foreign policy of the United States. I am proud to claim that I have gone around asking everybody I know, including bellhops, about the foreign policy of my country. I would be even prouder if I could claim that every citizen of this country, including bellhops, knew that we had a foreign policy. This I cannot claim.

The reason is not hard to find. As a Republican, I am glad that it was Republican Members of Congress who were waiting on Mr. Hull with questions about our foreign policy at almost exactly the time that Mr. Roosevelt threw away his chances for the "bellhop" vote. But, as a citizen, I am disturbed to learn that none of these Members of Congress came away from Mr. Hull with any very clear idea of what is our policy. If they could not get it from the man who has been in charge of our State Department since the first days of this administration, I am not surprised that the citizens of the United States should be confused.

POWER POLITICS

If this administration's addiction to diplomacy behind closed doors hurts us in the world at large, it does us still worse hurt at home. If secret agents who cannot even be named produce misunderstandings with our allies, they produce confusion among ourselves. If all the chicanery of power politics demeans us in foreign eyes, it saps in us the confidence and the aggressive proud spirit which belongs to Americans by birthright.

Just as military expediency has been used by the administration to cover up deals with Fascist turncoats, so has military security been used to cover up the slow, fumbling procedures of arriving at these deals.

In the newspapers and magazines of this country Americans have one of their surest guarantees against mistakes made by their leaders. A strong democracy makes no pretense of infallibility; it asserts instead that it has the capacity to discover and correct its mistakes before they become fatal, and a free press is essential to that process.

What has our press been able to do in the field of foreign policy to carry out its traditional function of reporting, examining, and discussing? It has accomplished near miracles, it seems to me, but only against very heavy odds and with only a partial verdict in its favor to date. Mr. Hull announced the other day some 17 points which, he said, explained our foreign policy. They were so vague and general that every good editor in the land must have wracked his mind to decide how they applied to the concrete problems which beset us.

The results have not been impressive. Here we are a Nation fighting for the survival of the ideas we stand for. Yet if anyone can say today with certainty what our policy is toward the Argentine, or Spain, or Finland, or Tito, or Badoglio, or De Gaulle, he is a better man than I am. If anyone can say what is our policy toward the great French people, he must have found out with a ouija board. The questions press on us from every side. Too often, the only answer we get is that military security prevents an answer.

A TIRED ADMINISTRATION

The real reason for the silence in Washington about these pressing problems is the administration's belief that it is way ahead

of the people and that the people cannot be trusted to back policies which are good for them. This belief, while not put into words by officials in Washington, is the basis of all they do. It grows stronger with long tenure of office. An administration that has become old and tired quite naturally prefers not to have to explain and justify its policies. Until election time, it figures cynically, it can afford the resultant confusion, even if the entire Nation is weakened.

All I have said makes a sorry answer to the question I started with, the question that is being asked all over this country: Have we a foreign policy? The answer is clear: Either we have none, or it is a dangerously personal one, that the President alone knows about to the exclusion of both Secretary Hull and the "bellhops"; or it is a policy which millions of Americans, if they were given the information about it that has been denied them, would repudiate as untrue to the principles of democracy.

If the war is to be won quickly and American lives saved, we need a better foreign policy. If our losses and sacrifices in this war are to be justified, we need a better foreign policy.

Our sons are not risking and giving their lives in order to support an outworn monarchy in Italy. They are not fighting in order to restore discredited kings to other countries. They are not fighting in order to make possible a deal with some renegade Nazis when Hitler has been overthrown. Nor are they fighting in order that the French people, or any other great people including our own, may be treated as a pawn in some desperate game of secret power politics.

The losses in young American lives which we have already taken and are now facing in even greater numbers can be justified only if this becomes truly a war for liberation. For if we deny those fighting for freedom in France, as this Administration is denying them now, we shall face not only civil war in that country but the repudiation here of all we thought we were fighting for. If we deny the democratic elements in Italy, as the Administration is now denying them, we shall slow up our armies and make still more terrible the task that lies ahead of us. If, in our foreign policy, we deny anywhere the aspirations of those who want to be free, as secret power politics inevitably tends to deny them, we shall be laying the groundwork for a third world war.

The American people have faith in the processes of democracy. They want a foreign policy that will affirm that faith.

Mr. HATCH. I might, Mr. President, to conclude my remarks, simply again reiterate the main thought I have been trying to express. It is that this is an hour of tremendous, strong, and mighty issues. Not only the welfare of our Nation but the peace of all the world and the hopes of all mankind may rest upon how we in this Nation discharge our duties and our obligations. Strong and mighty issues require strong and mighty men. I pray God, Mr. President, men who aspire to be President of the United States may be mighty enough and strong enough to meet the issues which today confront our country and the world.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to respond to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield the floor to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to speak only briefly.

I have yet to make my first partisan address in the Senate respecting foreign

affairs and American foreign policy since Pearl Harbor. I do not intend to do so now. It is rather difficult, however, to persist in maintaining that unpartisan attitude in the light of comments such as those just submitted by the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, which largely devote themselves to what he believes to be our dire Republican shortcomings in respect to this issue. It is rather difficult, Mr. President, to maintain—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall yield in a moment. It is rather difficult to maintain the unpartisan level in these discussions for which the Senator from New Mexico so eloquently presumes to plead and to which I have so faithfully adhered unless the rule works on both sides of the aisle.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan perhaps something which I should have said. While I was critical of the Republican Party in 1920, and the part it played in the great battle over the League of Nations at that time, I have frequently said publicly, and I say here now, that we should not be too critical of the opponents of the League on both sides of the Chamber at that time. Those men had just seen one world war. All their experience had been with peace. They thought war was an interlude between great intervals of peace, and perhaps rightly so.

We have seen two world wars in our lifetime. We have seen war become the normal course of action, and I do not want to be unduly critical of the Republican Party, or any man associated with the battle 25 years ago, because those men had not had the experience we have had. What I am trying to do, as best I can, is to point out those things, and say, Let us profit by the experience of the past. I do not wish to make a partisan appeal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand the Senator's purpose, and I have no quarrel with the very high dedication which I know is in his heart in respect to this problem. But I must frankly say that I am unable to harmonize his purpose with the address which he has just made, because it has been chiefly devoted, first, to a partisan indictment of Republicans of the past, and, second, a challenge to the Republicans of today.

Mr. President, I remind the able Senator from New Mexico that it is exceedingly dangerous to go back into the yesterdays and take ancient words from their place in history and give them isolated interpretation as of today. He may quote former platforms of the Republican Party which in his view were never validated. But, Mr. President, I give him a very pointed example of the danger and perhaps the utter injustice in any such process. I give him the example of the statement made by President Roosevelt on the eve of the 1940 election, "I tell you fathers and mothers of America again and again and again

that your sons will not be sent into foreign war."

Mr. President, I have never thrown that statement back in the President's teeth. I am not doing so now. Circumstances alter cases. Pearl Harbor created a challenge which no President and no citizen could ignore. I refer to the matter only to illustrate my point. It would be just as reasonable for me to devote an hour's exhortation to a Presidential promise to the mothers of America in 1940 that their sons would never again be sent into a foreign war, as it is for the Senator from New Mexico to file the indictment against Republicans which he has indicated here today.

Mr. President, I want it clearly understood that I do not file the indictment. It is the first time I have ever mentioned the matter in public. I do not intend to mention it again, unless it shall be unavoidable. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend now or hereafter to discuss the desperately important problem of foreign policy in terms of purely partisan politics. But I cannot sit silent in the face of less restraint across the aisle, and in the presence of the suggestion from that source that there is any lack of dependable loyalty and devotion to the great objectives of a lasting peace not only upon the Republican side of this Chamber but in the patriotic Republican hearts of this country, and in our Republican soldier sons who stand in the trenches and tread the valley of the shadow with their brethren in arms. I cannot allow the suggestion to pass that there is any less devotion to the ideals of the Republic among us who are Republicans than among those who are Democrats.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the record of the Republican Party during these desperately critical months in respect to foreign policy. The most forthright statement on foreign policy that has yet been made, the first formal announcement of its sort upon any basic political authority was made by last September's conference of the Republican Party at Mackinac Island, in its Mackinac charter. There could be no more forthright statement than this paragraph, which I proudly read:

We consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work . . . to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(A) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis.

(B) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war.

(C) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

And then this, the kernel of the whole statement:

Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

Mr. President, I submit that not even the able and eloquent Senator from New Mexico could assert an American dedication to post-war peace and to post-

war termination of military aggression around this world; not even he could mobilize in one sentence a deeper, more eloquent pledge than that. It was acclaimed from coast to coast and all around a grateful world. It is our sturdy answer to those who would seriously inquire our attitudes.

Mr. President, the able Senator from New Mexico is worried about where the possible Republican candidates for President may stand upon this issue. I do not know who the Republican nominee for President is to be. It is probably conservative to say that he will be one of at least two Governors. Both those Governors stood upon their feet at Mackinac, when the roll was called upon this declaration, and gave it their unequivocal faith. Let that assuage any anxieties upon this score.

I appreciate the solicitude of the Senator from New Mexico for our Republican situation. I am not at all worried about the ability of the Republican Party at Chicago to assert itself so that no American can misunderstand, and I venture the prophecy that the platform which the party adopts at that time, and the subsequent fidelity to it of its candidate for President, will leave no room for doubt that we stand incorrigibly for victory against all our enemies, that we stand for an effective cooperation among the Nations of this world for post-war peace, and for the termination of military aggression, and that at the same time we stand for a just peace which shall implement those major promises of the Atlantic Charter, which I fear have become in part too dim and may be fading, and that no American will misunderstand that our pledge and our performance will be in complete fidelity to the enlightened self-interest of our own sovereign United States in respect to effective world cooperation.

Mr. President, having said that, I want to announce that at a time when 10,000,000 of America's sons are offering their precious lives for freedom, I shall not again be drawn to my feet in the Senate Chamber, unless the circumstance be far more aggravating than it is today, to discuss the foreign policy of America in terms of partisan politics.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with my recent brief remarks I quoted from the Mackinac charter. At the suggestion of the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] who played a very large part in the achievements at Mackinac, I wish to add, for the RECORD, the final paragraph from the Mackinac charter:

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I regret the statement made by the Senator from Michigan at the conclusion of his remarks, because I firmly believe that now is the time to discuss these matters. Equally firmly do I believe that if discussion of them is postponed until after

the war is over, again we will do just as we did 25 years ago. I want just such expressions as the Senator from Michigan has made. They are fine expressions. They are statements of a determined purpose. That is what I want. That is what I was talking about. I have not criticized the Senator from Michigan. I have not criticized a single Senator on the other side of the Chamber. Among Senators on the other side I see sitting just behind the Senator from Michigan the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who has taken his position as strongly as a man can take it. That is what I want. That is what I think is fair to the electorate of this country. I wish every Member on both sides of this Chamber, every Member in the House, and every public official of the United States, as well as everyone who aspires to office, would take a similarly strong, positive stand, for then the people could make their rightful choice.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has indicated quite generally his own belief, and he has listened to a very able response by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] but the Senator from New Mexico would make a great contribution to the country if he could produce from Mr. Roosevelt a definite and a clear-cut statement of peace aims, and produce it now.

Mr. HATCH. If I may say to the Senator, I have already discussed that question, and I think the President's position is clear. I think it has been stated by his actions and by the things he has stood for throughout the years. I think it has been stated by the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, who speaks for the administration. I think it has been stated by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I do not think there is any doubt about that position. If there is an honest doubt in the mind of any man, I would join the Senator from New Hampshire and say, "Let us terminate the doubt."

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will yield further, I will say for his information that there is a doubt in my mind, and, in my judgment, doubt exists in the minds of most people in America today as to just where the President stands specifically on the question of peace aims.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say something on the matter under discussion, if the Senator from Nebraska will be good enough to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not happen to be in the Chamber when the Senator from New Mexico made his first statement. I entered the Chamber while the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was discussing the question.

Mr. President, as I indicated yesterday in some remarks I then made, I very much hope that the effort of our country to take a leading part in the establishment of machinery for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of ag-

gression will not take on any partisan or political tinge.

Of course, every Senator and every other citizen will have varying views as to the details of such a plan. But today we are engaged in the greatest military struggle that the pen of the historian has ever recorded. Men who enter the Army of the United States and who die on foreign battlefields do not die as Republicans or Democrats or Progressives or Socialists. They serve in the Army of the United States as Americans. If the United States is to be successful in its leadership, and if the problem of establishing adequate peace machinery is to be solved, those results must be brought about by a united people.

I hold in my hand the so-called Connally resolution which was adopted by the Senate on November 5, 1943, and I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CONNALLY. The Connally resolution was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 85 to 5.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, it seems to me, would inject a little partisanship in the questions which he propounded. Let me say that there is no statesman in the world, there is no citizen in the world who at this moment can look forward into the years and decide all the issues which will be raised around the peace table. We cannot settle today or tomorrow or the next day the question of boundaries in Europe which will come before the peace conference. We cannot settle those questions because the war is still raging, and they must in their very nature await the termination of hostilities. Whoever would interject them now would be throwing obstacles, digging tank ditches, and erecting barbed wire and all sorts of entanglements in the way of those who would settle these great international problems.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator feel that it will be throwing obstacles and erecting barbed wire and other entanglements in the way of a successful prosecution of the war if we state our peace aims definitely today?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we can state a peace aim or hope in a general way.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I mean completely.

Mr. CONNALLY. Completely? Very well, let us see how logical that would be. The Senator from New Hampshire desires that we state our position on every controversial question which will reach the peace table. He ought to know how improper and how illogical that would be. We would immediately become involved in ancillary quarrels perhaps with some of the nations with whom we are now cooperating in the war. We would stir up disturbance in

other countries which are perhaps not parties to the war, and it would absolutely retard and impede and interfere with the war effort itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield to the Senator, but I do not want to carry on a sewing-circle discussion. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is becoming a little impatient.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to say, if I may, that I do not agree with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. I accept the thanks. [Laughter.] But I wish to say that I think the Senator was absolutely wrong when he said that we should not today definitely discuss peace aims. I think it is a sad story for America and a sad story for the world that we cannot today frankly discuss what we are fighting this war for, and set forth in unmistakable language our definite peace aims.

Mr. CONNALLY. In looking into his private crystal ball, the Senator may be able to see the solutions to all problems and the roadways that ought to be trod by all the nations in arriving at decisions respecting the multitude of questions which will come before the peace conference. The Senator from Texas does not profess any such vision or any such knowledge. If we were to try to settle those questions now, it would perhaps mean that they would not be settled at all. I doubt not that conversations are going on between the chancelleries of the nations involved—at least those of the United Nations—in the way of a general outlook on many of these matters, but they are not seeking to arrive now at definite conclusions and decisions. If when a conference is held we should call in the newspapermen and publish to the world what was happening in the conference, it would probably be the last conference we would have, because other nations would not want to confer with a nation which, immediately after a meeting was held and prior to a final agreement and a settlement, publicized everything that had occurred.

Mr. President, this question is greater than political parties. It is greater than the Democratic Party. It is greater than even the Republican Party. It is greater than the Socialist Party, or the Progressive Party. This is a great world problem, and I do not wish to treat it from a "peanut" attitude. I believe that most of the leaders in the United States in all political parties, unless it be some of the "fringe" societies, favor the general principle of the establishment of a league or organization for peace, and to suppress aggression. Why not struggle with this problem as Americans? Why should we not mobilize all our forces of mind, intellect, soul, and spirit, rather than to be whispering, "What is going to be the Republican attitude?" or "What is going to be the Democratic attitude?" There ought to be an American attitude.

I have heard the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] read his pronouncement with respect to the conference at Mackinac. I have no fault to

find with it, so far as it goes. I might go a little further than the Mackinac charter. I might differ with some of its details; but I rather think it was an unfortunate thing. For the party to meet and organize and set up its own formula might be regarded as a little unfortunate; but I welcome such declarations, and I hope that Republicans will not divide on partisan considerations. They did not divide on partisan issues when the so-called Connally resolution was adopted. They have not been dividing on partisan or political considerations in the conferences which we have held with the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, now is a critical moment, because the United States is taking the lead. I think I am authorized to say that it has already submitted a general outline and framework of a peace organization to some of our associates among the United Nations, in the hope that they may reach some general agreement and work out the details at a later date.

Mr. President, let us not smear this effort by political debates. Let us not obscure our vision and cloud our outlook by trying to label it and stamp it as Republican or Democratic, but let us face this problem and solve it, and give the world leadership.

The greatest memorial we could erect to the brave men who will have shed their blood in this conflict, and to the heroes who will have laid down their lives, would be the establishment of an organization dedicated to the prevention of wars in the future, the preservation of peace, and the mastering and chaining of the cruel monsters who plunge the earth in blood. Such a memorial would be better than bronze or marble. Marble is so cold that it could never picture the fire and the dash of battle. Bronze is so voiceless that it could never adequately express the gratitude of a nation.

Such a memorial would reach beyond the towering obelisks of granite and stone. It would pierce even the skies if we could set up such an organization for the safety of the world, and establish a refuge from aggression, not for Republicans, not for Democrats, but for all the nations of the world—a refuge from attack by military might or by evil forces that seek to destroy liberty and freedom everywhere.

Mr. President, that is the meaning of this program. It does not comprehend the narrow boundaries of nations. It envisions the far-flung corners of the world. It contemplates not the safety of a group of individuals but the safety of whole peoples and of the world at large. If we will but embrace it and succeed in its establishment in the world, this is a project worthy of the great nation which we represent. It is particularly appropriate that the United States of America should be the progenitor of such an organization.

Our own past history, colonial and constitutional, for 300 years, is a romance in the march from individual hardship to political liberty and to a great state of prosperity. On this continent we have exemplified the undying principles of

constitutional government and representative institutions. Today they are the goal of all nations of the earth which desire liberty and freedom. Today on this globe we symbolize, for the moment, at least, the ultimate in free government. If the United States is not a worthy sponsor for such a program, then there is no worthy sponsor.

Mr. President, I feel that we have a particular destiny in this world. I feel that, as we have achieved these high and responsible functions in the world as a nation, we cannot afford to wrap ourselves in the cloak of satisfaction, but that we owe to the peoples and nations of the earth leadership toward the general achievement of these lofty and noble objectives.

That, Mr. President, is the project which I envisage, far beyond political considerations, reaching far beyond the boundaries of any state.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

EXHIBIT 1

Senate Resolution 192

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his very pertinent remarks. Before I take up a subject which involves a domestic issue, and not one on the foreign front, I wish to express to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] my profound gratitude for the statement which he has made today on the floor of the Senate. His statement was in keeping with the dignity and the true characteristics of a great American who, during all these months, has declined to drag the foreign policy of our country into partisan politics. As one Member of the minority, I am proud that we have such an able representative on the Foreign Relations Committee as the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. I am proud of the fact that earlier today, after the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] began to deliver a nonpolitical speech, but subsequently indicted the Republican Party, and then nominated President Roosevelt for a fourth term, a Member of the minority

rose and with great dignity stated, though rather reluctantly, the position which all of us on this side of the aisle have so much wanted to hear him set forth, in order that he might defend, not the Republican Party, but the position which every American might well take with reference to the foreign policy of this country at this time.

Recurring to a domestic issue which I think is very important—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say I have tried my best to submit these remarks for at least 2 hours, and I should like to make them now. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

LABOR PROGRAM OF WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Recently War Manpower Commissioner Paul McNutt announced a labor program allegedly for the purpose of meeting, as he said, "the increasing demands for male labor in the heavy critical industries."

His release of June 4, 1944, certainly proposes to allot manpower to the places where it is most needed. In that respect I wish to commend him. He expects to accomplish that result by a system of priority referrals and, second, by holding all workers in critical and vital industries. This priority referral program is one which depends upon, he says, "the cooperation of employers, who," as he stated in his release, "may hire male employees only from those referred by the Manpower Commission's United States Employment Service or in accordance with arrangements approved by the United States Employment Service."

In reviewing Mr. McNutt's release, it is apparent that it is his desire to effect voluntary cooperation on the part of both the workers and the employers. In that respect I certainly wish to commend him for the program. But from the language attributed to Mr. McNutt in the release, from the language of the release, and from the explanation he made of the act, which I heard in the meeting he provided for us, it is certainly a fair assumption that if this labor priority referral program does not work on a voluntary basis, then it must rely upon compulsion.

At the time when that program was elucidated and explained by War Manpower Commissioner McNutt to a group of Senators, I asked him the question, "Governor, in the event the voluntary provisions of this program fall down, what do you expect to do to enforce the provisions of the program?"

He replied, "The only thing we could rely upon then would be compulsion."

I asked him, "Upon what legal authority can you assume such compulsion to conscript labor, if your program does not work in a voluntary way?" He said he felt he had none.

I asked, "How do you expect to use it?"

He replied, "First, by the priorities on labor; second, by withholding priorities for materials from employers; and, last, by suggesting that all benefits and advantages such as social security, unemployment insurance, and so forth, be

used to force laborers to accept the jobs to which they want them to go."

Because of that statement, on June 6, 1944, there was published in the Omaha World Herald an editorial which refers to the various phases of this program. It is not only a literary gem, but the argument contained in it is very logical. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY EDICT, OR BY LAW?

Congress, since the beginning of the war, has consistently played horse with the duty of establishing by law a definite labor policy.

Such labor policy as obtains is established chiefly by Executive caprice and favor. And this policy is foggy, incoherent, and inconsistent, except for the general assumption that employers have no rights which Government need respect.

And this tends inevitably toward a condition in which labor, too, begins to feel that its rights and interests are imperiled.

It is so now with respect to Paul McNutt's seizure of control, as War Manpower Commissioner, over male labor above the age of 17 years.

"The Government," complains a spokesman for the Illinois and Chicago federations of labor, "has not shown there is any need to withdraw from the worker the freedom to seek his own job as he sees fit to seek it. * * * Only 3 weeks ago McNutt testified that there was no need for national-service legislation, and that any such law should be enacted by Congress, and not be put over on the people by administrative edict."

The regional director of organization for the A. F. of L. in Chicago declares the McNutt order amounts to regimentation and brands it as "uncalled for, inadequate, and unnecessary."

When last January the President asked Congress for a National Service Act, it was opposed in and out of Congress, and by both labor and management, as calculated to establish bureaucratic domination over civilian men and women workers. That opposition has continued—but, so far as Congress is concerned, as opposition only. Nothing affirmative and definite has been attempted by a drifting and timid Congress. Now, by edict, McNutt becomes, in the words of one labor leader when opposing the national-service proposal, "God Almighty, determining what plants and areas would be supplied with draft labor."

It is not to the point now to discuss the merits or the needs of a National Service Act. The point is that, if military considerations clearly require it, then it should come as an act of Congress after free and careful consideration, and not be imposed under another name by Executive action.

For it is in just this way, due to the creeping paralysis of Congress, that Executive power grows by what it feeds on, supplants government by law, and approaches ever more surely toward a one-man absolutism.

From that all citizens, including workers and employers alike, must surely suffer. And suffer not alone economically, but in the far more important respect that distinguishes self-governing freemen from tyrannically governed subjects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, President Roosevelt advocated a national-service law, and Members of the United States Senate have advocated a national-service law. The suggestion has met with considerable opposition. There has also

been much said recently about the drafting of IV-F men and their assignment where needed in essential industry. Much opposition has also been expressed to such a policy as being only another means of invoking the provisions of a national-service act.

Now we have the War Manpower Commission, in my opinion without constitutional or legislative authority, invoking the necessary provisions of any national-service legislation which might be enacted, and we find the War Manpower Commissioner effecting just such a program. If this plan works on a voluntary basis—and I hope it does, and I shall give my support to it—then of course we shall commend the War Manpower Commissioner for such a program. But the moment the War Manpower Commissioner attempts it by using one directive against another, by withholding priorities of materials from employers, in order to force them to do thus and so, then he is by edict compelling the conscription of labor, without legislative authority.

The question I am raising is not whether it is my opinion or your opinion, Mr. President, that we should have conscription of labor. That in itself has been provided by bills which have been introduced, but have not yet been brought to the floor of the Senate. But I say when the time comes that compulsion is used, then once again by Executive order the legislative function of Congress will have been overridden.

What the War Manpower Commissioner and the administration should do is come in the front door of the Capitol and persuade some Senator to bring up on the floor of the Senate one of the bills referring to the conscription of labor, and see what Congress thinks about conscripting the labor of the country. When that time comes, I shall be glad to see to it that compulsion is not used unless it is backed up by legislative authority of the Congress of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator has finished, I think I shall take the floor in my own right.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a short time ago the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] addressed the Senate. I am sorry he is not now present. I told him what I would put into the RECORD, so he is not unadvised.

He referred to a speech made by the President of the United States in Boston. It was to be implied from his remarks, as well as from the subtle propaganda which has been spread over the country, that something President Roosevelt said in his Boston speech violated his subsequent acts; in other words, that he had deceived the fathers and mothers of America.

I give the Senator from Michigan full credit for saying he did not wish to inject such a thought into this debate; but as a matter of fact he did inject it into the debate; he did mention it; and he implied that Mr. Roosevelt had said

something at Boston which was contrary to subsequent actions.

So I sent for a copy of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, volume 9. I shall read first from the speech he made at Boston, because that is the speech which those who would attempt to cast reflection upon the President so frequently have used.

Here are the President's exact words. The President said at Boston—I read from page 517, if anyone is interested:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

That ends the quotation, Mr. President, with all the implications which those who oppose the President seek to draw from it. There are other statements of the President which I shall later read, but I have chosen this one because it has been criticized on the ground that he assured the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would not be sent abroad to engage in foreign wars. I declare on the floor of the United States Senate that the pledge of the President has been kept. The sons of America have not been sent abroad in foreign wars. The youth of this land fight and die today in no foreign war. This war is our war. It is a war of the Republicans and the Democrats alike. It is a war of America. It is not a foreign war.

Why did the President use the words "foreign war"? Oh, I remember so clearly, Mr. President, how I sat in the Senate day after day and listened to arguments to the effect that the boys of America would be sent abroad to engage in every war between foreign nations—in wars in which we would have no interest. President Roosevelt assured the fathers and mothers of America that if their sons were sent abroad it would be to fight America's war. Are they not now fighting America's war? A vote was taken in the United States Senate with reference to entering into the present war. Senators made declarations. I made them and I meant them. I would never have consented to send our sons to fight the battle of someone else. Ninety-six Senators—if there were that many present—voted for the declaration of war. They were not voting to send the sons of America into foreign wars. They were voting to send the sons of America to fight America's war. I hope, Mr. President, that never again will anyone draw such an invidious and despicable inference from what the President of the United States said in Boston.

I did not quote all that he said. I have before me a copy of another speech which he made. I recall it very well because I was a member of the resolutions and platform committee of the Democratic Party at Chicago. I remember that there were those who urged that under no circumstances should America's soldiers be sent abroad. I recall quite clearly the firm stand which was taken by the President against such a resolution. I reveal no secrets when I say that

the President said in effect, "Why, certainly I agree that American soldiers shall not be sent abroad." But he added, "except in case of attack."

Mr. VANDENBERG rose.

Mr. HATCH. I have recently read what I have already shown to the Senator from Michigan, and I have drawn the conclusion that when the President referred to foreign wars he meant foreign wars. We are not now engaged in a foreign war. We are engaged in America's war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not understand that the Senator has challenged the accuracy of my quotation. I believe I quoted the President precisely as the Senator has read.

Mr. HATCH. I am not quite sure about the quotation, but I showed it to the Senator from Michigan, and he agreed that it was correct. It was the quotation to which I have referred, and I am sure the Senator from Michigan intended accurately to quote it. If he did not do so it was due to a failure of memory.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I quoted it accurately, Mr. President. The only word that might have been omitted was the word "foreign." From my point of view that word would be the last one which I would wish to omit at that point.

Mr. HATCH. I doubt that the Senator omitted it. I wish to make it clear that I was not referring to the Senator from Michigan when, before he entered the Chamber, I said that I hoped never again would such an invidious or despicable statement be made as had been made, that the President's promise had been violated when he said that. I have not charged the Senator with that statement. It is invidious and more or less despicable, but I certainly did not apply it to the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator previously reminded me that we cannot take isolated cases in history. I was not doing so, but I had referred to what took place at the Democratic Convention and the fact that the President himself stood out for the words "except in case of attack."

I now read from another speech made by the President in his campaign. It is to be found in volume 9, at page 495. He said:

We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes.

I think the President was exactly right. At least his statement expressed my theory. I voted for all measures to prepare this country for war, not from the standpoint of intervening in any foreign dispute but purely from the standpoint of defense.

On this subject the President said:

We will not participate in foreign wars.

That was a flat declaration. It was a repetition of what he had said at Boston, although this statement was made first. In effect he said, "We will not intervene. When two foreign nations get into a war, let them fight it out."

Then he said:

We will not send our Army, naval, or Air Forces to fight on foreign lands except in case of attack.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement which the Senator from New Mexico has read is one which many persons fail to remember. Those who are inclined constantly to attack the administration because of the phraseology which the Senator has read, always, either through ignorance, or through willfulness, fail to include the entire statement which the President made. That statement was carried out in the platform of the Democratic Party in 1940, while the Republican platform was completely silent upon the subject.

Mr. HATCH. I have already mentioned that point. I was a member of the platform committee, and I remember quite well, as I stated a moment ago, that there were members of our committee who flatly insisted on a resolution that under no circumstances would our sons be sent abroad.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I see no utility in extending the argument, but I wish to refer to the observation made by the Senator from Illinois.

The two quotations which the Senator from New Mexico gave were taken from different speeches, were they not?

Mr. HATCH. One was taken from the speech made at Boston, and the other was taken from a speech in Philadelphia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is not true that it is a failure properly to quote the President to say that he said, "I tell you again and again and again that"—

Mr. HATCH. "You fathers and mothers"—

Mr. VANDENBERG. "You fathers and mothers, that I will not send your sons into foreign wars."

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The qualifying phrase "unless we are attacked" came from a different speech, and I assumed from the observation of the Senator from Illinois that he was accusing anyone of being dishonest who quoted the President's speech without adding the phrase "unless we are attacked," which was a part of a totally different speech.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It was during the campaign of 1940 that the Boston speech was made.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. There can be no question that the President made the statement not only once, but twice.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Notwithstanding the policy which was laid down at that time by the President of the United States, I assert that he is continually being misquoted. Those who want to take all the speeches that the President made upon foreign policy—and that is the only way it can be ascertained what he actually meant—are doing the President of the

United States a disservice by referring to a single quotation without adding to it what the President said in his Boston and other speeches.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator just said exactly what I undertook to say in the remarks I made to the Senate a short time ago. The quotation to which I referred and everyone who heard me knows I said it—was used solely to prove the precise point the Senator from Illinois now makes. What I was objecting to about the speech of the able Senator from New Mexico was that he had taken isolated sentences out of ancient Republican history and had endeavored to base an indictment upon those quotations, whereas if the whole story be told in each instance the net result may be precisely as indicated by the Senator from Illinois with respect to the quotation of the President regarding foreign policy.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the reason why if the Senator from New Mexico will permit me I prefaced my quotation by saying that I had never made it heretofore in public, that I never intended to make it again, and that I do not believe in that sort of quotation.

Mr. HATCH. I may say that I hope the forthright, straightforward statement made by the Senator from Michigan that he would never again use that statement may be taken to heart and that the dire implications which he did not make will never be made by others in this campaign.

I have no disagreement with the Senator from Michigan; we get along very well; but I did want to make the Record clear. I wanted the Record today to show that Franklin D. Roosevelt had not violated any promise he had made to the fathers and the mothers of the sons of America. He did exactly what he insisted upon doing in Chicago when he said that our sons would not fight in foreign wars. They are not fighting in foreign wars; they would not have fought if it had not been for the cowardly and dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor, and it ill behooves any Member of this body who voted for war to say that the President of the United States has done something he should not have done, because the responsibility for declaring war lies here in the Congress of the United States. We assumed that responsibility rightly, and today it lies in the mouth of no man to criticize the President of the United States.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID (LEND-LEASE), U. N. R. R. A., AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4937) making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$357,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 8, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 202. In addition to the sum appropriated by section 201 of this title, any supplies, services, or funds available for disposition or expenditure by the President under the act of March 11, 1941, as amended (22 U. S. C. 411-419), and acts supplementary thereto, may be disposed of or expended by the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944, without reimbursement of the appropriations from which such supplies or services were procured or such funds were provided: *Provided*, That the supplies, services, and funds disposed of or expended under the authority of this section shall not exceed a total value, as determined under regulations to be approved by the President of \$350,000,000 and shall be charged to the amount authorized to be appropriated by said act of March 28, 1944: *Provided further*, That the authority granted by this section shall not become effective until the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff shall have issued a certification that the state of the war permits the exercise of such authority and the utilization of lend-lease supplies, services, or funds for the purposes of section 201 of this title; and after such certification such utilization shall be upon the determination of the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to be sure that I understood the text of the amendment. There is no question, is there, I will ask the Senator from Tennessee, that this transfer from executive funds applies against the total authorization for U. N. R. R. A. in the original resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Therefore, this is in no sense different from an ordinary appropriation, except that it uses existing funds instead of new ones.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why was it decided to use the funds of lend-lease rather than a direct and specific appropriation? Was it for the purpose of making it conditional?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, the conditions might change, so that it is better to write the provision as it has been drafted.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand it, it is also conditioned on the action of the Chiefs of Staff, so that, unless they make proper certification, the money cannot be obtained from lend-lease funds. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. Every safeguard was thrown around it by the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to say that personally I do not like the system of transferring funds from one agency to another. I think the sounder system

is for the Congress to make direct appropriations for an agency rather than to say an agency may obtain money from some other funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Ordinarily, that is true, I will say to the Senator, but in this case there was a different situation, a different set of facts, and, under the circumstances, the committee thought it best to take the course proposed to be taken.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Lend-Lease in Attack Vanguard," written by a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEND-LEASE IN ATTACK VANGUARD

WASHINGTON, June 6.—D-day.

The greatest production miracle in the history of mankind preceded the invasion announced today.

No country ever before even contemplated the production record which the United States achieved, and which is now the mainspring of the drive to crush Germany.

The mainspring of lend-lease has been winding tauter and tauter in the British Isles for the past 2 years. Now release has come, and its coiled energy will spring forward inexorably until its task is finished.

Those who saw a small part of the stored goods prepared for the invasion adventure were unable to express their emotions save in parables.

BRITISH ISLES "SINKING"

"The British Isles are slowly sinking under the weight of the accumulated invasion stores," one commentator ejaculated.

A few weeks ago Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, disclosed that 28,000 planes alone were sent abroad to America's allies between March 11, 1941—the date when the Lend-Lease Act was passed—and January 1, 1944.

More than \$1,600,000,000 worth of aircraft engines and parts went abroad.

It is on lend-lease that the superstructure of America's military machine is built. French and British, and later Russian, orders put American industry in a position of war production.

Since March 1941 America has organized the greatest Army and Navy air forces in the world.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND AIRPLANES

America has turned out 150,000 airplanes.

For months past not only trained American troops have been poured into the British Isles, but the massed might of America's industrial power, converted to military uses, has been concentrating there.

Now this gigantic invasion equipment has begun to move.

Months and years of preliminary production by the most highly industrialized power on earth have gone into the final order to advance.

The sheer massed weight of America's armament, combined with the British, may push obstacles aside, strategists hope.

HUGE AIRCRAFT OUTPUT

Mr. Crowley told Congress recently that \$460,000,000 worth of lend-lease aircraft engines and parts were sent to the United Kingdom alone, down to January 1.

An additional \$240,000,000 went by direct cash purchase.

Millions of gallons of high-octane aviation gasoline power the thrust. Lend-lease steel, lend-lease explosives, barges, gliders, road rollers, cranes, bulldozers, let alone prime

movers, tanks, half-tracks, and all the panoplied articles of war, are moving today.

It's not merely the soldiers who are going ashore on the continental beachheads in the great invasion drive!

It's the miners who took the ore, the drillers who brought in the oil, the men at coal seams, the big-muscled men with foreign names who puddled blazing steel. It's their invasion, too.

The invasion drive is the Army and Navy, plus all America.

It's the farmers who milked the cows that made the cheese for the soldiers' rations; it's the women who loomed the clothing and Army blankets that will be spread on wet ground, it's the office workers who untangled the paper work, the brakemen who manipulated the troop train, the telephone girl who put in the last long-distance call from the doughboy back home to Mom, before he went overseas.

GREATEST BATTLE IN HISTORY

They are all here today in the greatest battle in American history. Britain and the United States open the second front and they are there, too.

Only hints have come of the exact amount of goods stored in Britain. But anyone in America is blind who does not have the firsthand experience of its preparation. Factory windows have blazed all night. Ship after ship has taken the water. Firms have energetically advertised for help. Great supply depots have appeared outside cities, and have dwindled as their stored-up military power went overseas.

Down to January 1 of this year Americans have been told that \$20,000,000,000 in lend-lease aid have been extended to the Allies. But this only begins the story.

The lend-lease aid has been, in a sense, surplus—that could be expended out of America's extravagant productive ability while America's own armies were built up, fed, equipped, trained, and finally moved overseas. Of the total the figures roughly show that 43 percent of lend-lease has gone to the United Kingdom forces. Much of this is being thrown into the struggle now.

AMERICA CHANGED

But aside from this, the whole face of America has been changed by war production for America's own forces.

Now the time of testing has come.

Are the boats seaworthy that take the men across? Are the weapons balanced to the touch? Does that rubberized raincoat shed water? Are those camouflaged pets well and securely tied? Did the girl who folded that silk parachute do her job faithfully? Are those gliders for air-borne troops properly engineered? Are those prefabricated barracks nailed securely? Is the ammunition sound and lively? Do those reeling anti-aircraft guns shoot truly? Now is the testing time. It is too late to do anything much now but hope and have faith. Americans at home who built the road for invasion are confident their battle forces are the best-equipped in the world.

Under Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, American ground troops will meet the Germans in direct combat, with the equipment the American Nation has poured out profusely. The result of the encounter determines the length of the war in Europe. An army of 1,000,000 Americans may be engaged. But into the equipment of this Army has gone the work of 20 times that number, and the supplies range anywhere from the butter ball on the side of a first sergeant's platter to a 2-ton bomb carried at 10,000 feet in a Flying Fortress.

ARMY REQUIRES CARE

An army is like a city; it has to be fed, clothed, transported, provided with shelter,

warmth; it needs utilities like fresh water, right up to the front-line trenches; it has to have postal services, or its morale sags like a wilted collar.

An army moves on gasoline, and it is significant that to date \$670,000,000 worth of petroleum products alone have been shipped under lend-lease, while perhaps a figure comparable to that has gone to the American invasion army itself. Tankers have brought gasoline to the British Isles to supplement Britain's own supplies, fleets of tank cars, partially assembled on the other side, painted olive drab, are bringing the gas to invasion barges; engineer corps are ready to lay a system of pipe lines to new continental air bases and quickly establish depots on the other side. Enormously intricate plans accompany any battle and the cross-channel invasion is, of course, one of the greatest feats in military history. Only one thing is more important for its triumph than the quality and quantity of the equipment which the American worker and the American production machine have turned out—that is the Army itself.

With weapons in hand it is going forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed **Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS** conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, REPORT BILLS, AND SO FORTH, DURING THE RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. **Mr. President,** it is desired by some Senators that the Senate take a recess until Thursday. In view of the possibility that that will be done, I ask unanimous consent that, during the recess following today's session, authority be given to the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the House of Representatives, to committees to submit reports, and, in addition, to the Committee on Appropriations to submit notices of motions to suspend the rules in the case of certain amendments to general appropriation bills; and to the Presiding Officer to sign duly enrolled bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing a nomination which was ordered to lie on the table.

(For nomination this day withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, June 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 13 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

POSTMASTER

NEW YORK

Myron A. Paul to be postmaster at West Falls, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Lord of heaven and earth, we need so many things to walk worthily of Thee; patience to wait, a ready hand to help, and a tongue undefiled. Amid awful spiritual perils, toiling against angry winds and waves, O let not the night of doubt engulf us in the dismal distress of materialism. Beneath the throbbings of weak flesh, arm us with a zeal that never questions and with a vigorous type of citizenship upon which our Republic can depend.

In Thy name, the faith of the world has been kept alive by men and women who had a vivid and an unwavering sense of the divine presence whose names are known to the recording angel only. In these days of suspense, countless are the eager hearts, choking back the tears and fears. In this most baffling world with its toil and death, caused by man's cruelty, with its gods of power and greed, we pray for the spirit of the Father, who is touched with a feeling of our infirmity. O throne of grace, O throne of our Elder Brother about which our longings and yearnings fall, give to those who are crossing the seas of affliction the heavenly voice. Let the blast of the storm winds, the march of the nations, and the majesty of the everlasting law become Thy servants to Thy honor and glory. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4771. An act to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves;

H. R. 4833. An act to extend, for 2 additional years, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar;

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution providing for operation of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; and

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript containing an analysis of questions and answers on the Individual Income Tax Act of 1944 as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof for the use of the House document room.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1538) entitled "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1767) entitled "An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4204) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate still further insists upon its amendment Numbered 10 to the foregoing bill.

LOWELL MELLETT LIBELS TEXANS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, neither the State of Texas nor any citizens of Texas need defense on such an absurd imputation as that made by Lowell Mellett. It answers itself. As a columnist writing on a factional political fight in Texas, Mr. Mellett has a perfect right

to express his views. When, however, he intimates that the conduct of any group of Texans as to a political matter would cause them to be lynched, I respectfully submit that he has gone beyond the pale of freedom of speech and has been guilty of libel.

The last two paragraphs of an article by Mr. Mellett in the Washington Star of June 10, 1944, read as follows:

If the busy boys who have been working through the back counties of the Southern States trying to produce something different really think they are going to succeed, there is one other thing they should be doing for their own safety or the safety of the anti-Roosevelt electors they are seeking to name. They should move in on Congress and get that anti-lynching bill passed. For, if the innocent southern gentlemen named to be electors should cast their votes for anybody except the man the South has really voted for, there's likely to be a lot of high-class lynchings down where the cotton blossoms grow.

Anyone who suggests that the passage of the so-called antilynching bill would safeguard anyone from being lynched simply evidences his complete disqualification to speak or write on such an issue. It might reasonably be contended that the passage of such a bill might have just the opposite effect. It shows the abysmal ignorance of this writer when he suggests that the passage of that bill could possibly prevent a lynching, under any circumstances. All who know anything about the problem know that the only force that could stop lynching is enlightened local public opinion. That is the force which Texas and the South have used to stop the crime of lynching until it is almost as extinct as the dodo. There has not been a single lynching in Texas in years. There were only two lynchings in the entire South last year.

Therefore, this libel of the South, and particularly of one group of Texans, should be resented by every right-thinking person.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article, To the Flag, by Bishop Richard J. Cushing, administrator of the archdiocese of Boston, and in the other an article on a recent Supreme Court decision by John Griffin, appearing in the Boston Post on Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a radio address, and in the other two, newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article that appeared in the Tennessee Farm Bureau News.